DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 955 UD 020 868

AUTHOR Remy, Gwendolyn Mikell
TITLE Brown V. Board of Education: 25 Years Toward Equal Educational Opportunity. An Educational Staff Seminar Forum to Assess Equality of Educational Opportunity.
INSTITUTION George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.
PUB DATE Feb 79
NOTE 23p.: Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Civil Rights Legislation; *Educational Legislation; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Higher Education; Minority Groups; *Resource Allocation; *School Desegregation; Social Influences; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Brown v Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The effects of the Brown decision on equal education for minority groups in America and the contemporary social context in which the decision is applicable are the subjects of this paper. The author contends that as we have not yet reached the stage in American society where equal opportunity exists and race ceases to be a factor in the distribution of social and economic resources, the Brown decision is still relevant to current educational issues. In this context, she discusses (1) strategies that can be employed by minority group leaders to achieve equal educational access; (2) expansion of the implications of the Brown decision beyond a black/white issue, to include Native Americans, Hispanics, and other minorities; (3) competition for educational resources between different "special needs" populations; (4) problems of equal access particular to urban areas; (5) the issue of postsecondary desegregation with regard to black colleges; and (6) the question of race versus social class as indicators of educational disadvantage and, thus, special need. This paper was intended to provide background for a series of panels, seminars, field trips, and other events scheduled for 1979 by the sponsoring organization. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JUL 2 1 1980

UD

ED191955

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION

25 YEARS TOWARD EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

An Educational Staff Seminar forum
to assess
equality of educational opportunity

The Educational Staff Seminar is a program of The George Washington University's Institute for Educational Leadership

1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

DIANE BRUNDAY
INST. FOR EDUC LEADERSHIP

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 020868

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION

25 YEARS TOWARD
EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

In the 25 years since the landmark Supreme Court decision, educators, legislators, civil rights organizations and both minority and majority educational institutions have been involved in the attempt to make equal access to education a reality. Equal access today takes on new and broader meanings than those which were defined 25 years ago. Accordingly, ESS is presenting a series of events which is designed to highlight many of the continuing and new questions.

January 25 — "The Future of Equal Access in Education"

A forum with Nathaniel Jones *(General Counsel) and* Gerda Steele, *(Director, Educational Programs) of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) -- The discussion will focus on elementary and secondary as well as higher education issues. Reactors will be* Meldon Hollis, *Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Education, and* Bevan Dufty, *Legislative Assistant to Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm.*

February 12-16 — "Puerto Rico: An Overview of Elementary, Secondary and Higher Education"

A five-day visit to a number of schools and discussions with school officials, educators and legislators -- Participants will be able to assess current developments within the educational system in Puerto. Emphasis will be on how the federal system affects education, and on implementation of government programs such as Title I and Title IV.

February 27 — "Desegregation in Higher Education: A Workable Approach to Achieving Equity and Parity for Blacks and Other Minorities?"

A program co-sponsored with the Institute for Services to Education (ISE), in which we will present a dialogue among the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), representatives of state educational systems, and state coordinating bodies -- Participants will include Albert Berrian *(ISE),* Thelma Cox *(Baltimore School Board),* Leonard Haynes *(ISE),* Jesse Stone *(Southern University System, Louisiana),* David Tatel *(OCR), and* E. T. York *(Florida Board of Regents).*

March 13 — "Black Colleges - Present and Future"

A discussion of some of the recent research being done to assess the economic status and future prospects for Black colleges. Presenters will be Morris Keeton, Director of the Ford Study on Black colleges and Steve Wright, Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

(continued on inside back cover)

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION

25 YEARS TOWARD EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

An Educational Staff Seminar forum
to assess
equality of educational opportunity

written by:

Gwendolyn Mikell Remy
Education Policy Fellow

prefaced by:

Emerson J. Elliott
Acting Director

February 1979

JUL 1 5 1980

PREFACE

Nothing has so affected the essential character of the federal government's involvement in education in 1979 as the Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education in 1954. That milestone in American civil rights established an environment in which federal education laws mandating most of the everyday actions of the Office of Education and the Office of Civil Rights were enacted. It was a setting for those monuments left by President Johnson in federal support for education -- The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and its Title I; the Higher Education Act of 1965 and its aid to "developing colleges" and aid for financially needy students; and the Economic Opportunity Act with its Head Start, Follow Through and Adult Basic Education programs. While the government's primary orientation has been to racial discrimination and to compensation for the effects that discrimination has had on educational opportunity, the post-Brown era also nurtured assaults on discrimination due to ethnicity, sex, age, and handicapping conditions.

After 25 years no one would argue that equality of educational opportunity has been achieved. But, clearly conditions have changed over this quarter century so that specific remedies the courts directed in the 1950s would, in many cases, be irrelevant today. Citing one example, "de jure" segregation has virtually disappeared but "de facto" segregation -- scarcely

known as a public issue in 1954 -- has been more intractable and may even be spreading. Another example, educational attainment -- not just equal expenditure and desegregation -- is a concern of policymakers and civil rights advocates as well as in 1979. But policymakers also have their eye on inflation, taxes, level of public services, and government regulation in 1979.

The anniversary of Brown is a landmark to be observed. But it is also an opportunity for reflection, assessment and projection into the future for public policy. ESS was particularly interested in bringing to its participants some points of view that are not always heard by the Washington education policy community. In our early attempts to explore programs in commemoration of Brown that would give special recognition to views of minority leaders, we were reminded that minorities intend to define the issues toward achieving equality and not to leave shaping of the form and substance of equality of opportunity only with representatives of the majority population. While some people might label such a stance as "racist", others find it in tune with the growing body of literature about individual motivation concluding the obvious -- people want to make their own decisions about those things that affect them. Indeed, over the past several years, there has been a host of criticism of "rational" analytic processes in public policy issues. No longer do we believe that a "good" analyst is good in every situation. The conduct of public policy analysis involves value judgements and assumptions and these may be made differently depending on one's experience and training. Hence, how the issues are set forth and who states them have been matters of substantial concern as ESS prepared this group of programs.

ESS has invited Gwendolyn Mikell Remy, Assistant Professor of Anthropology at Georgetown University and currently IEL Education Policy Fellow, to develop this special Brown commemoration series. Gwen has written about and conducted research on such issues as ethnic and cultural factors in education, youth services in inner city areas, and culturally sensitive data in Civil Service questionnaires. She has advised Georgetown students in foreign service and international programs and worked with the Center for Minority Student Affairs. Prior to 1976, she was faculty adviser for research in the Black Studies Department at Rutgers University and chaired the Advisory Board of Educational Opportunity Funding Program.

Devoting nearly full time to these issues during her fellowship year, Gwen has been in touch with dozens of organizations and individuals in her work. In the comments below, she reports her findings from studies over several months and provides the background setting for the Educational Staff Seminar panels, seminars, field trips and other events scheduled over the first half of this year.

Emerson J. Elliott
Acting Director

February 1979

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION

25 YEARS TOWARD EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Minority anthropologists are increasingly 'coming home' after an era of research in other parts of the world, to discover that their talents are greatly needed in the solution of social problems confronting Blacks and other minority groups. It is, understandably, becoming much clearer to them that there is a definite link between social research and the actions taken by national governments which affect these racial and ethnic groups. The Black, Hispanic, or Native American anthropologist is, therefore, forced from his 'value-free' stance, and must accept the fact that his work MUST have policy implications which may advance or set back social change for disadvantaged minorities.

Education has become an important concern for social scientists because it is in this arena that some of the major battles over the distribution of social resources are being fought out. While the advice of social scientists is sought by government in determining educational policy, only a small percentage of these social scientists are minorities or those who are knowledgeable about the social impact of educational policies for minority groups. Social scientists with specialists in education, urban studies, or multi-cultural U.S. studies can make a valid contribution in educational research and in the development of educational policies which increase minority access to quality education.

EDUCATION IN SOCIAL CONTEXT

Equal access today takes on new and broader meanings than those which were defined by the Brown decision of 1954. The past quarter-century has witnessed changes in north-south migrations, changes in the size and number of minority groups, and increased conflict between majority and minority populations for educational resources which 'appear' to be in short supply.

The Bakke challenge to affirmative action in student selection within higher education must, therefore, be seen as one of the 'signs of the times'.

The question of whether Brown is obsolete has, despite continuing controversy, only one clear answer: NO! We have not as yet reached the stage in American society where equal opportunity exists and race ceases to be a factor demanding recognition in the distribution of social and economic resources. For example, in the 1978 Bakke decision a host of other affirmative action questions were raised, yet the Supreme Court affirmed the significance of race as a factor in educational decisionmaking. Second, some Black and Hispanic groups feel that unless there is additional support from the courts and the educational policy community, attacks on the educational gains of the past 15 years will intensify. They fear, for example that new regulations for Title III (developing institutions) will mean that Black colleges lose their eligibility for funding if they cannot guarantee increased student repayment for loans, thus demonstrating good "manageability" of federal funds. Such concerns have prompted minority educators and administrators to give closer scrutiny to educational policy with an aim to influencing its formation in directions which are supportive of quality education for minorities.

Any reflection on the contemporary status of equal access in education must, therefore, deal not just with whether or not the legal promises of Brown have been fulfilled, but with what the contemporary meaning of that legal decision becomes;

what the present social climate will dictate about the manner in which the social and legal obligations of Brown are to be carried out; which groups of American citizens, in addition to Afro-Americans,must now receive the legacy of Brown as well as the legacy of subsequent civil rights legislation; and lastly, what overriding equal access needs are likely to be in the future, given present social realities.

January 25, 1979	"The Future of Equal Access in Education", Gerda Steele and Nathaniel Jones of the NAACP discuss future directions and concerns in elementary, secondary and higher education

STRATEGIES FOR EQUAL ACCESS

At the present time there is considerable diversity even within minority communities as to how the nation should go about guaranteeing equality of access to education in the coming decades. The divergence in strategy is essentially reflected in the lack of consensus on whether equal access is best pursued by enforcing integration in all educational arenas, or by creating effective and productive educational communities regardless of whether they are racially/ethnically homogenous. The focus of controversy has turned to whether minority children have made gains within integrated environments, and of course, achievement scores are produced to verify either side of arguments such as those posed by Kenneth Clark and James Coleman. It becomes apparent that considerable research work remains to be done in specifying the factors within integrated educational environments which heighten successful adjustment by minority children.

The issue of elementary and secondary school integration has been the source of much controversy. Although in the majority of desegregation cases, integration has occurred peacefully, voluntarily or with very little violence, the fear of violence between racial communities has been widespread. Boston, therefore, stands out as an extreme example of this violence, and anti-desegregation forces (both majority and minority) are often quick to refer to Boston as the actualization of their worst fears. If, however, sizeable segments of both majority and minority communities are seeking to avoid the conflict by creating homogenous, "culturally-comfortable" educational environments for their own children, a larger question arises: What is the difference between "culturally-comfortable" environments, and the "separate-but-equal" stance of the earlier decades? How far have we come since Brown?

In the current legislation, and in federally funded education programs, the government position is clear: integration of educational institutions is the policy. Yet other strategies are useful in achieving equal educational opportunity, and the minority community often questions the failure of federal programs to seriously investigate these alternative routes. Although integration is the long-range goal, it is a fact that for the present and for some time to come, the education of minority children will take place in racially-identifiable schools. Therefore, the complaints of many minority administrators (that the government lacks a commitment to equal opportunity in education), must be given serious consideration. If the seriousness of the federal commitment to equal opportunity is to be measured by the dollars

which are spent and the federal programs which are enacted to guarantee excellence in curricula and teaching in ghetto schools, then the low federal expenditures in this area do indeed indicate a lack of commitment. If busing is taken as an index of seriousness about equal access, then the continual 'tack-on' of anti-busing riders to leglation -- thus preventing significant federal support for busing -- also gives weight to assertions of insufficient commitment to desegregation as the approach to equal access. While integration may be the ideal, the reticence within the executive branch about 'busing' deepens the doubt that there is support for the 'tools' with which equal access may be achieved.

Most people would agree that elementary and secondary school desegregation is the strategy which, given present social realities, demonstrates the speediest results in achieving interracial exchange. Whether it should remain so in the future, and whether it results in equality of educational opportunity is the controversy. The anticipated outcomes of desegregation, a raising of achievement scores and cross-cultural exchange, have yet to be sufficiently demonstrated. The all-too-common by-product of racial anxiety and lack of self-confidence among minority children is the source of much concern. This trend has prompted a number of pro-desegregation organizations such as the NAACP to place greater emphasis on parental involvement and on government programs (aside from desegregation efforts) such as Title I and legislation such as P.L. 94-142 which broaden the meaning of equal access.

The issue of integration v. educational excellence in minority schools is one which deserves greater scrutiny. It

may best be approached by social scientists and educators who try to specify: 1) the given social and cultural factors which affect the orientation of minority children to the educational processes, 2) the facts vs. the 'myths' about desegregation, both pro and con, 3) those factors which lead toward positive academic performance in selected minority schools in urban areas, and 4) what the facts suggest about economic and political factors in urban education which affect minority children.

April 26, 1979	"What Do We Know About School Desegregation?" An update on desegregation information, and investigation of remaining research issues. (co-sponsored with NIE)

EXPANDING THE LEGACY OF BROWN

The Brown decision of 1954 raised the consciousness of other disadvantaged groups in the U.S. which have consequently, benefitted from Brown and its attendant legislation. Since the 1960s, such groups as Native Americans and Hispanics have been quite vocal about their equal access needs. Equal access issues have, accordingly, changed to include these groups. Desegregation in this context, becomes not just a black/white issue, but a multi-racial/ethnic concern.

Issues of bilingual desegregation are often posed as if the various minority groups are in competition with one another for the limited fiscal and educational resources of the urban areas where they reside. Many minority educators suggest that the apparent competition is, in fact, unreal; that the actual competition is between minority groups against whom discrimination has taken place, and the more affluent majority populations

with control over educational planning and political decision-making. They suggest that despite different educational needs for Black and Hispanic groups, their general needs for an education which overcomes the limitations of language and cultural barriers, means that they should present a united front on their educational needs.

In a number of major cities where the representation of non-Black minorities is great, those who have to learn English as a second language pose unique educational and political problems for desegregation planners. Bilingual desegregation within this context merely becomes the mixing of two minority populations (Black-Hispanic, for example), of which both may have specific,but different,educational needs in order to achieve equal access. It is often incorrectly argued that there are severe logistical problems involved in creating bilingual desegregation environments....problems which would not exist if bilingual programs remained in areas where the concentration of Hispanic or French speakers was high. On the other hand, minority desegregation specialists justifiably point out that this would maintain the majority/minority separation and that the injustice of racial-cultural isolation is equally as great as the injustice of linguistic isolation. They urge that bilingual desegregation alternatives be found so that the poor of various races are not simply mixed with each other in the name of equal access.

In the case of large cities (Miami, for example), the fact that significant Caucasian (and often middle-income) populations are located in predominantly suburban or non-urban areas, has

caused educational planners to seek desegregation over a large geographical area in order to avoid desegregation which only takes place among minorities. Magnet schools (which are designed to draw children from various areas of the metropolitan area depending on their interests in the curricula) are often relied upon to create racial balance. Depending on the model used to achieve the racial balance, magnet schools have had variable outcomes. Some have resulted in racially diverse but economically homogenous populations within the school, while others mix racially/ethnically diverse populations for only part of one or two school days with little progress toward achieving multi-cultural exchange.

While there are a number of issues which are to be confronted in the desegregation dilemma, the central issue is a two-part one: the necessity of supporting the original cultures and languages while educating children to participate fully in American life.

February 12-16, 1979	"Puerto Rico: An Overview of Elementary, Secondary and Higher Education" A field trip to assess current developments in education.
March 21-23, 1979	"Bilingual-Desegregation: field trip to Miami and rural Florida" (briefing sessions conducted by Gordon Foster of the Desegregation Assistance Center - University of Miami
April 1-3, 1979	"St. Edwards College--Austin,Texas" Visit to a school which has programs for children of migrant farmworkers in the Rio-Grande Valley.

COMPETITION BETWEEN DIFFERENT 'SPECIAL NEEDS' POPULATIONS?

The overlap of racial and cultural minorities with other groups which have special educational needs (such as the handicapped) raises additional issues which those concerned with equal access must confront. Through ESEA Title I, many low-income minority children in urban areas have had access to programs designed to increase their ability to succeed at what has been called the core of educational programs. However, special education programs have also historically been dumping groups for minority youngsters whose educational problems pose administrative difficulty. Labeled as mentally retarded or emotionally handicapped, they are unable to advance with their peers, or to have their problems dealt with. Despite legal protections of the 1970s, some observers such as the Massachussetts Advocacy Center believe that the problems of minorities in obtaining appropriate education programs still exist. Discrimination continues.

These observers point out that minority parents are justifiably concerned about labeling and dumping minority children into 'special education'. Alternative concerns focus on the 'co-mingling' of children with differently diagnosed special needs into one group because of inadequate funds for separate treatment, or improperly handled 'mainstreaming' which leaves children with special needs unable to perform successfully in ordinary classrooms.

In a political arena seemingly growing fiscally more conservative, advocates are concerned that programs for the disabled and programs which have provided needed support for

schools which are predominantly minority will become competitors, pitting two minority groups (racial and handicapped) against one another. Many civil rights and educational organizations express concern since the minority community has a very real need to see both the Title I set aside for special education and Education of the Handicapped legislation (P.L. 94-142) implemented in effective ways. They feel that parents and supporters cam employ their energies most effectively by attempting to shape these programs in ways that complement rather than compete with each other.

EQUAL ACCESS IN URBAN AREAS

In urban areas it becomes extremely clear that educational issues are so deeply interwoven into the larger social fabric that equal access in education becomes unobtainable unless social scientists and policymakers are willing to encounter related economic and social concerns. The need for better coordination between the large numbers of federal programs which address equal access in education, health, social welfare and housing in urban areas is becoming a more obvious issue. If de facto segregation is to be lessened within cities, the placement of middle-income housing projects, private housing and health facilities must obviously be done in conjunction with educational planners. Scholars and desegregation specialists are encouraging policymakers to enlarge the scope of their vision so as to see the ways in which other social policies and programs which lie outside the education arena have an impact on the educational process. They urge that equal access not be addressed in a vacuum as if other political structures, economic levels and urban problems were non-existent.

Urban education is, understandably generating a great deal of interest among minority educators and educational policy-makers because of the large concentrations of minorities in cities. While the failure of urban test scores to rise significantly points to problems in school structure and curriculum, educators are pointing out that the solution should not be worse than the problem. They suggest, for example, that the recent trend toward Minimum Competency Testing (MCT) when implemented as an exit requirement without accompanying support throughout lower grades, may have the impact of preventing the flow of minority children through the educational system. While they wish to guarantee that minority children emerge from the educational process with a certain common body of knowledge necessary to succeed in life, they suggest that curricula, not tests, should be the focal point.

April 5, 1979	"The Coordination of Federal Programs which Impact on Desegregation" These programs will be assessed by Gary Orfield (University of Illinois) and Lois Quinn of the Metropolitan Integration Research Center - Milwaukee.

DESEGREGATION V.. BLACK COLLEGES

Post-secondary desegregation has been a heated issue since the early 1970s. As a result of the case of Adams v. Richardson (now Adams v. Califano), many states alleged to have dual (racially identifiable) systems of post-secondary education are now mandated by the Justice Department to submit plans to HEW for the elimination of any duplication in programs between Black and white schools. The debate is being fired on both sides

by states which refuse to dismantle dual systems, and by Black educators and administrators who claim that mandated desegregation will deflect Black institutions from their historic social purpose. Organizations such as the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education claim that the restructuring will have a negative impact on the administration of traditionally Black institutions, thus rendering them incapable of servicing Blacks and other minorities whose needs have not been met through other post-secondary institutions. These organizations point out that they have produced over 70% of those Blacks currently holding graduate and doctorate degrees.

Executive branch officials often point out that White House directives instruct agencies to continue support for Black colleges and that contrary to popular belief, both desegregation and present federal programs should assist rather than deter the development of traditionally Black institutions. The response from many Black colleges indicates disbelief, since, they claim desegregating Black institutions to achieve racial balance would render them ineffective to Black education needs, and that recent Title III program regulations which require demonstration of good "manageability of federal funds" might disqualify those Black institutions whose students are unable to repay student loans. The feeling that perhaps federal program money should be used in new ways designed to stimulate growth was widespread. Some Black institutions point out that they possess a unique ability for dialogue with developing countries, since they service many Caribbean and African students,

and that money for the development of International Education programs would be most effectively used if it were channelled primarily to Black colleges through minority consortia groups.

Black college administrators express concern about their continued viability, about size of Title III grants, and whether they will continue to receive federal program funding in the future. However, representatives of state educational coordinating bodies sometimes have a broader perspective on what is needed in order to guarantee equal access to post-secondary education on a state-wide basis. Perhaps the disparity in their views reflects an alternative emphasis on long-run as opposed to short-run goals and problems. There is obviously a need for continued dialogue between minority and majority college administrators and educational coordinators on the problems and prospects in post-secondary desegregation.

February 27, 1979	"Desegregation in Higher Education: a Workable Approach to Achieving Equity and Parity for Blacks and Other Minorities?" A dialogue co-sponsored with the Institute for Services to Education.
March 13, 1979	"Black Colleges - Present and Future" Morris Keeton's presentation of current research on economic models and future prospects for Black colleges.

REDEFINING EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY?

One issue stands out in terms of the repetitiveness with which it emerged in our dialogues with minority educators and organizations. This was a concern about whether the definition, means and context of EEO was changing in response to increasing

pressure from the majority middle-class. In the wake of social reactions typified by the Bakke case and related court cases which challenge the use of race as a factor in equal access, Blacks and Hispanics are asking whether EEO is becoming a buzz-word with an unstated implicit meaning. Is EEO becoming, in reality, "EOMC" (educational opportunity for middle-class), given developments such as the middle-income student assistance act (P.L. 95-566). "Race v. class' characterizes the current agrument in educational and political circles. Many scholars might justifiably argue that the increasing size of the Black and Hispanic middle-class forces a reconsideration of whether these race/ethnic groups (as a whole) have equal access needs. The minority poor on the other hand have not had the educational benefits which wealthier minorities have gained. Perhaps educational policymakers need to give greater thought to the cross-section of race and economic level in designing tools to achieve equal educational opportunity.

As a fitting finale, the major question from minority educators seeks to remind educational policymakers of the tie between education, politics and economics: "What is the cost of EEO, and what are the social costs to society (e.g. in unemployment and crime) if we decide that it cannot be afforded?" Those are by no means rhetorical questions. Social psychologists such as Lloyd Humphries examine the educational problems of the poor as though they were self caused and insurmountable because of the financial resources and the social burden which is required to correct them. Logical extensions of this argument are voiced by both laymen and scholars who argue that we can no longer afford the social costs to repair past educational

injustices through affirmative action. The 70s have become the period for questioning fiscal expenditures with scholarly justifications which do indeed point to the link between academia (if not education) -- politics and economics.

While all these questions and issues must be confronted over the coming decade, the 25th anniversary of the Brown decision provides an opportunity for policymakers to take stock of the directions in which we must move toward equality of educational opportunity.

May 1979	"Race and Socio-economic Class as a Factor in Equal Access"
May 16, 1979	"IEL Forum: Brown - 25 Years Later" A dinner discussion with the IEL Advisory Board, and other associates of IEL focusing on equal access in Education.

Gwendolyn Mikell Remy
Education Policy Fellow

March 21-23

"Bilingual-Desegregation: Field Trip to Miami and Rural Florida"

A three-day visit which will include briefing sessions conducted by Gordon Foster *(Director), the Desegregation Assistance Center, University of Miami, as well as visits to schools involved in metropolitan desegregation plans for Dade County -- Emphasis will be on factors involved in desegregating Cubans, Blacks and whites in Miami and surrounding rural areas.*

April 5

"The Coordination of Federal Programs which Impact on Desegregation"

A discussion of research which will assess the impact of federal programs -- The presenter will be Gary Orfield, University of Illinois with reactor Lois Quinn of the Metropolitan Integration Research Center - Milwaukee.

April 2-4

"St. Edwards College, Austin Texas"

A visit to a school which has had an impressive record of success with children of migrant farm-workers in the Rio Grande Valley -- Through financial assistance, academic support services and rigorous standards they feel that they are providing the conditions for academic success and social entry into U.S. society for a group usually left out. The trip will include meetings with state officials, University of Texas officials, visits to rural schools near Austin and a look at the bilingual debate in Texas.

April 26

"What Do We Know About School Desegregation?"

A program co-sponsored with the National Institute of Education (NIE) -- There will be a presentation of what is known about desegregation as well as delineation of some of the remaining research questions and needs. (TENTATIVE)

May 16

"IEL FORUM: Brown - 25 Years Later"

A dinner/discussion at which the IEL Advisory Board, executive and legislative officials and representatives of various organizations meet to discuss equal access to education in the present period.

"Race and Socio-economic Class as Factors in Equal Access"

A program which will focus on problems of color and class within the increasing minority community within the U.S. A number of questions will be posed such as whether social mobility means the absence of educational problems for Blacks and other minorities.

For more information regarding upcoming events in this series, please call the ESS office at 202/676-5949.

The Educational Staff Seminar is a program of The George Washington University's Institute for Educational Leadership, with offices located at 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 310.